

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are all the claims pending in the application.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Huy T. Nguyen for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interview conducted on June 20, 2010. During the interview, proposed claim changes were discussed for claim 1, as well as the reasons why it is believed that claim 1 distinguishes over the prior art references applied in the Office Action.

In this regard, Applicants note that the changes to claim 1 presented herein are identical to the claim changes discussed during the interview, and that the Examiner agreed during the interview that the proposed claim changes overcome the current grounds of rejection as set forth in the Office Action of March 22, 2010. It is noted that claims 4 and 7 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1, and are therefore also believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 4 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishige (US 7,386,219) in view of Chatani (US 7,111,693) and Wilkinson et al. ("Tool and Technique for Globally Unique Content Identification").

Claim 1, as amended, recites that the recording unit is operable to store, into the second data, the serial number of the recording medium on which the first data is recorded. As indicated above, it was agreed upon during the interview that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest such a feature.

In particular, as discussed during the interview, the Ishige reference discloses a video data recording apparatus that generates encoded data of high resolution (see output of encoder

1B) and encoded data of low resolution (see output of encoded 1A), and the Chatani reference discloses an apparatus that reads program and/or data from a recording medium based on an ID for identifying the recording medium, wherein the ID is recorded on the recording medium.

In the Office Action, the high resolution data of Ishige is being interpreted as the claimed “first data”, and the low resolution data of Ishige is being interpreted as the claimed “second data” (see Office Action at pages 2-3). In addition, the ID of the recording medium in Chatani is being interpreted as the claimed “serial number” (see Office Action at pages 3-4).

In this regard, as discussed during the interview, even if Chatani is considered in combination with Ishige, that the resulting combination would not teach or suggest that the low resolution data (i.e., “second data”) would have stored therein the ID of the recording medium on which the high resolution data (i.e., “first data”) is stored.

In other words, even though Chatani discloses the use of a recording medium ID, it is respectfully submitted that if Chatani was combined with Ishige, that the ID of the recording medium on which the high resolution data of Ishige is recorded would not be stored in the low resolution data of Ishige.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Wilkinson reference does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Ishige and Chatani.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 1 which indicates that said recording unit is operable to store, into the **second data**, the serial number of the recording medium on which the **first data** is recorded.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 4, Applicants note that this claim has been amended to recite that said search unit is further operable to (i) identify the recording medium using the serial number of the recording medium on which the first data is stored and (ii) search for the first data in the identified recording medium using the identification information included in the second data, when the first data is searched.

For reasons at least similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 4 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants note that this claim has been amended so as to recite that said recording unit is operable to store, into the second data, the serial number of the recording medium on which the first data is recorded, and that said search unit is further operable to (i) identify the recording medium using the serial number of the recording medium on which the first data is recorded and (ii) search for the first data in the identified recording medium using the identification information included in the second data, when the first data is searched.

For reasons at least similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 7 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishige (US 7,386,219) in view of Chatani (US 7,111,693) and Wilkinson et al. (“Tool and Technique for Globally Unique Content Identification”), and further in view of Basso et al. (US 6,292,805).

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1; claim 5 depends from claim 4; and claim 8 depends from claim 7. Applicants submit that Basso does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Ishige, Chatani and Wilkinson, as described above, with respect to claims 1, 4 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, 5 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Keishi OKAMOTO et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By 2010.06.22 11:05:03 -04'00'

Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 22, 2010